DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 574 FL 010 418

AUTHOR Johnson, William H. E.
TITLE The Development of Soviet Society: Perspectives from Educational Experience. Keynote Addresses from the Horace Mann Lecture Series and the Paul Masoner International Lecture Series, 1972-1978.
INSTITUTION Pittsburgh Univ., Pa. School of Education.
PUB DATE 2 Jun 76
NOTE 10p.; Small print may be marginally legible

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communism; Educational History; Governmental Structure; *Government Role; *Nationalism; *Political Influences; Public Policy; Social History; *Socialism; Social Problems; Social Studies
IDENTIFIERS Autocracy; *Russia; *USSR

ABSTRACT

Historical, philosophical, and social perspectives concerning the development of Soviet society are presented. The concepts of orthodoxy, autocracy, and nationalism that were integral to Russian life for nearly one thousand years of history are discussed, and principles of socialism and communism that were inaugurated in November 1917 in accordance with Marxism-Leninism are described. Analysis of certain major areas of Soviet policy indicates that Russian tradition and contemporary social pressures have forced or persuaded the Politburo to depart from the guidelines of classical Marxism in several instances: (1) long-time retention of severe restraints on civil liberties; (2) reduction of trade-union authority; (3) creation of elite castes in government, management, diplomacy, the military, and even the arts; (4) failure to make a higher standard of living a real goal in any of the several Five-Year Plans so far adopted in the Soviet Union; (5) increased contradiction between mental and manual labor, and between urban and rural life; (6) dissolution of the Communist International and the failure to preserve a united front of the socialist nations; and (7) toleration of religious practices and the restoration of the Church to active participation in social affairs. Persistent problems which 60 years of Soviet socialism have failed to ameliorate are discussed. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
School of Education
Univ. of Pittsburgh
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

WILLIAM H.E. JOHNSON
University of Pittsburgh

ED172574

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOVIET SOCIETY: PERSPECTIVES FROM EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE

JUNE 2, 1976

The Historical Perspective

During a period of nearly one thousand years of history, the Russians developed a trilogy of concepts known as ORTHODOXY (one church), AUTOCRACY (one ruler), and NATIONALISM (one people). It is my belief that these same concepts continued to dominate Soviet thought and action even today. The 1917 Revolution, it is true, produced a new religion (Marxism), a new sovereign (whoever heads the Communist Party) and a new patriotism. Yet the demands of these institutions upon the ordinary Soviet citizen bear an astonishing resemblance to those long imposed by Altar, Throne, and Fatherland.[1] A brief comparison of developments in the two spheres of Europe during the past few centuries may help to explain this phenomenon.

Orthodoxy. At about the same time that heresy and heterodoxy were growing within the Roman Catholic Church of Western Europe (the period 1400-1700), a stringent and rigorous orthodoxy was being clamped on the Russian Empire. While other denominations such as Moslems and Roman Catholics were permitted to hold services, only members of the Russian Orthodox Church were deemed eligible for high political office or, indeed, even for salvation! No dissent from religious doctrines was permitted members of the church, and prominent citizens were frequently accused of laxity in this matter.[2]

As the Russian Empire extended eastward and southward, still other religious sects (Buddhists, Taoists, Confucianists) fell under its sway, and all were required to conform, at least outwardly, to the dicta of Russian Orthodoxy. In the case of the numerous Jews in Russia, the history of pogroms and restrictive pales is too well known to need repeating here.[3]

Autocracy. Thus, by 1917, the Russian Empire was effectively dominated by one Church in much the same way as it was dominated by one central government in Petrograd. And here we come to another contrast between East and West. Throughout the sixteenth century, while England enjoyed the enlightened rule of Henry VIII and his daughter Elizabeth, Russia was in the grip of Ivan the Terrible. The seventeenth century—noted in the West for such figures as Shakespeare, Bacon, Galileo, Newton, Descartes, and Locke—was marked in Russia chiefly by the enthronement of the Romanov dynasty which was to rule to the end of Tsardom.[4]

During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, when in Western Europe and America revolts against tyranny were becoming widespread and even fashionable (and, in a few cases, successful), the iron heel of Autocracy was being held upon the peoples of Russia by Peter, Catherine, two Nicholases, and all three Alexanders. For example, when Tsar Peter I set up his Naval Academy in the new St. Petersburg in 1715, he not only chose the site and designed the building, but he also established the curriculum and wrote the qualifications for all nine of the original professorships.[5] (It is true that our own Thomas Jefferson did much the same thing at Charlottesville, Virginia, a century later, but many institutions of higher learning already existed in the USA, while the Naval Academy was the only such establishment in Russia.)

The Empress Catherine II also had a large measure of confidence in her own ideas and power. Even though she had invited the great French Encyclopedist, Denis Diderot, to her court to be her "adviser on education," she sent him home in 1775 for daring to suggest that Russian girls should study anatomy! But no one can deny Catherine's interest in learning: in the course of her 35-year reign she spent 30 million rubles on schools, and only 25 million rubles on her various lovers.[6]

Her attention to the emergence of new nations, however, was not as evident. In December 1780 the new U.S. Congress sent Francis Dana to St. Petersburg to seek recognition of the USA. Dana waited in the anterooms of the Imperial Palace for nearly two years, and never even saw Catherine! He once offered to see her at night if she were too busy during the day, but was told that would be impossible because the Empress was even busier at night! When the great lady did finally get around to discussing the new nation with her foreign minister, Potemkin, she explained that she could never recognize a government which was atheistic (because it denied the divine right of kings), was made up of "the common rabble" (meaning the bourgeoisie), and which wouldn't survive anyway because it was contrary to human nature. It is an interesting irony of history that these were almost exactly the same reasons Woodrow Wilson gave for refusing to recognize the Soviet government in 1918.[7]

Nationalism. We now come to the final watchword of the trilogy: Nationalism—one people. Despite the fact that the territories of the Russian Empire which bordered Germany and Austria-Hungary were inhabited by millions of non-Russians such as Ukrainians, Poles, Latvians, Estonians, Jews, and Lithuanians, all of these peoples were forced to study the Russian language. Russian was the language of instruction in all state schools, and in all courts of law. The many national minorities of the Caucasus, Central Asia, Siberia, and the East were much more difficult to "Russify," but even there all power was held by Russian governors and officials sent out by the Tsar and his ministers. Every effort was made to stamp out the inherent sense of *their own* nationalism in these peoples, and to substitute adherence to the codes of the Russians. It is no wonder that the Russian Empire in 1917, with its perhaps 150 ethnic groups, was called a "prison of nations."[8]

How has this trilogy of concepts fared under the Soviet regime? Undoubtedly, the content and meaning of all three terms has undergone considerable change during the past sixty years. Orthodoxy is no longer a religious matter, but political. The Holy Scriptures have been replaced by a carefully edited series of selected works by Marx, Engels, and Lenin—bolstered from time to time by ephemeral writings of current Communist Party leaders. There have been, for example, at least four "official" histories of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and upon the appearance of each, the preceding version has been banned. As a leading observer has said: In the Soviet Union, the present and the future are secure; it is the past that keeps changing. "Truth" is what we read in *today's*, not yesterday's,

PRAVDA. Actually, this political orthodoxy is much more rigidly enforced than ever was the doctrine of the Russian Church, and the penalties for heresy more violent and more frequent. One need only recall the famous "treason trials" of 1935-39, when thousands of Soviet citizens were executed and literally millions sent to prison camps, to realize how seriously the Gospel must be taken in the Soviet Union today.[9] The cases described in the works of Alexander Solzhenitsin are real, not fantasies, and they continue to the present day.

If Orthodoxy is stronger under the Soviets than under the Tsars, what then of Autocracy? What has happened to the power to *enforce* Orthodoxy throughout the realm? Alas, that too has become much stronger and even more ruthless. Thousands of dissenters in Tsarist Russia found it easy to evade the nets of the policy by fleeing abroad, as did Lenin himself. Or to escape from inprisonment, as did Stalin. Or, if incarcerated for long periods, it was possible for rebels to write political tracts of even a scholarly nature, since books and materials were permitted. The death sentence for political heresy was seldom imposed even in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Catherine II defended her resolve to execute Alexander Radischev by declaring him to be "more dangerous even than Benjamin Franklin," but she relented and sent him to Siberia.[10] And Fedor Dostoyevsky was reprieved from a firing squad at the last moment when the captain of the guard discovered that he really was a famous novelist.

Thus enforcement of doctrine has been strengthened enormously by combining the Tsarist techniques of secret police, personal passports, and Siberian camps with modern techniques such as drug usage, mechanical surveillance, widespread informers, and the deeply rooted Soviet suspicion that everyone is a possible traitor. As a result, more people in the Soviet Union have endured political persecution during the past half-century than in all previous history since the Edict of Constantine forbade religious persecution in the Roman Empire.

Has Nationalism fared any better in the new regime, or has it too become more violent and coercive? Here we can see at least a partial change for the better. Even though the Russians now constitute a very slight majority of the total population (53% in the 1970 Census), their power over the other nationalities is enormous. Despite the democratic appearance of the Supreme Soviet, where all large minorities except Jews are represented, the real power in all matters resides in the Central Committee of the Communist Party and especially in its twenty-man Politburo, almost all of whom are Russian. Although textbooks for the elementary and secondary schools are printed in forty different languages, all but a few of them are written originally in Russian, by Russians, and then translated. Native language is the medium of instruction in all elementary schools in the non-Russian republics, but Russian must be studied every year from the third grade onward, and parents can choose for their children either Russian or native language schools at the secondary and higher levels of education. In the Russian republic (RSFSR), comprising 76% of the area and 53% of the population of the entire nation, all schools at all levels (except for the autonomous sections already mentioned) offer all instruction only in the Russian language. Moreover, the RSFSR possesses 28 out of the total 51 universities and more than half of all other higher educational establishments. Therefore, if a student wishes to increase his or her chance of admission to higher education, that student had better learn the Russian language very well. Add to these facts the axiom that Russians determine the *content* of all education in all the schools, and we see that, again, old Russian nationalism prevails in a greatly expanded form.

But it is in this great expansion that the Soviet regime can lay claim to one of its greatest accomplishments: the dissemination of education to all its peoples. Left

with a population in the European part of Russia only 60% literate in 1917, and only 5% literate in Central Asia, the Soviet government has lifted the median educational level above eight grades throughout the nation, and hopes soon to provide at least 90% of its young people with a complete ten-year formal education (equivalent in class hours to our twelve-year school). The real force of the Soviet educational effort can best be seen in Central Asia, where total literacy and a *minimum* of four years of schooling have been provided about thirty million people who, if left to the normal efforts of the Tsars, would have reached this stage only in the year 4000![11]

The Philosophical Perspective

The basic doctrines of the Soviet Union are known as Marxism-Leninism, and these doctrines usually act as guides to all major Soviet policy. Taken altogether, the doctrines constitute the Communist philosophy or, as the Russians call it, the "Communist World-View." It is in strict accordance with these principles that the Soviet government, beginning in November 1917, inaugurated a series of programs toward the establishment of Socialism in that country and ultimately Communism all over the world. Among the most important of these programs in accordance with Marxism-Leninism are:[12]

Complete abolition of private property in the means of production. Nothing that produces wealth can be in private hands, but individuals *can* own any articles of consumption. Thus one can own one's house or apartment, provided he does not rent out any part of it or use it in any sort of manufacture, but he cannot own any land whatever. This proscription also applies to media of exchange such as stores and banks, and to means of distribution (railroads, bus lines, etc.), as well as to all communications systems.

Establishment of a dictatorship in the name of the proletariat but actually controlled by the upper echelons of the Communist Party, which Marx called "the vanguard of the proletariat." There is considerable evidence that Marx, as well as Lenin and Khrushchev, saw this "vanguard" as the 200-member Central Committee of the Party rather than the small Politburo, but the latter emerged as omnipotent under Stalin and remains so at present.

Creation of a highly industrialized nation with a huge working class all employed by some state or collective agency. In two generations, the Soviet Union has passed from 65% rural to 65% urban which, for a population of 160 million (in 1917) and a present 250 million is a tremendous achievement in social mobility.

Establishment of a wage system based on Marx's own dictum: "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work." The initiation of the "piece-work" system in Soviet economy during the First Five-Year Plan (1928-32) offended many classical Marxists who misunderstood the difference between the socialist and communist "stages" of economy, but it was completely in accord with the slogan quoted above. Marx also allowed for quality of work as well as quantity, which is why teachers and doctors receive more pay per hour in the Soviet Union than do street-sweepers and other unskilled laborers. Marx also said that "he who does not work, neither shall he eat," and it is hard for an able-bodied person to find a place to live or get enough to eat unless he *does* work for the state.

The Soviet Constitution defines two forms of public property: state and collective. The first includes most factories, stores, railroads, etc. and a great many large farms. There is no doubt that this is just as Marx wanted, but the "collective" type seems to have been developed by Lenin and Stalin as a transitional stage, particularly in the area of agriculture. Here wages are calculated on the basis of the number of days worked by each family unit, rather than on individual production.

The collective farm system has been tried out by everyone of the East European nations which has fallen under Soviet influence, and all have given it up (as in Poland and Yugoslavia) or modified it considerably. Even in the Soviet Union it has proven to be the least efficient of all types of production, yet the Russian leaders persist in retaining it in much the same way as American leaders continually encourage and promote aspects of private ownership which have long since passed into obsolescence.

The use of Machiavellian tactics and "power politics" in international relations. Both Marx and Lenin held the view that "whatever serves the cause of Communism is good," and therefore all bourgeois moral and ethical precepts were to be ignored unless they conformed to this rule. Even the notorious Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of 1939, which permitted Hitler to begin his war against France and England with his eastern border secure, had to be extolled by all Communists throughout the world as a boon to mankind because it diverted the Germans from attacking the Soviet Union.

The institution of large-scale reforms such as the improvement of working conditions for the laboring class, social insurance, health care, sex equality, and education—all of these would be applauded by Marx. However, as we shall see later, Marx might have thought some of these reforms have failed to go far enough.

Utilization of the selective system in education, based on abilities in specific areas rather than a broad, general and liberal program of studies. In many of his works, Marx spoke of the waste of educating persons for jobs which suited neither them nor the society. He would greatly admire the Soviet system where all education above the uniform and compulsory eighth grade is specialized in one way or another. Even the last two years of the ten-year school, where the curriculum tends to be a continuation of the eight years of general education, actually lead to a rather narrow professional education in the universities. The universities themselves number only 51 with a present enrollment of only 510,000, while the 750 specialized "institutes" are training four million students in more than fifty specific fields. Mention was just made of the non-general nature even of secondary education: at present there are more than 4000 specialized secondary schools enrolling 4.5 million students in 3-4-5 or 6 year courses of study in the same fields as the institutes.[13] In Soviet education as in Soviet life as a whole, Marx's slogan of "from each according to his ability" holds true: one's whole education must be geared to the needs of the state, not the wishes of the individual. The leaders believe that to educate a person *beyond* his ability to serve society is just as wasteful as failing to educate him at all. Naturally, the Soviet leaders view *our* educational system as having no plan, no tangible direction, no uniformity of purpose, and no intelligent process of selection.

In delineating the Soviet practices which do NOT conform to Marxist theory, a large degree of subjective interpretation is unavoidably present. Marxist scholars themselves often disagree on major aspects of the theory, and certainly we must permit the Soviet leadership as much leeway in their interpretations as is accorded Tito and Mao. However, a careful analysis of certain major areas of Soviet policy indicates that Russian tradition and contemporary social pressures have forced or persuaded the Politburo to depart from the guidelines of classical Marxism in several instances:

Long-time retention of severe restraints on civil liberties, which Marx thought would be employed only during the early stages of the "proletarian dictatorship." As a matter of fact, Marx and Engels wrote that, in time after the new regime was established, "the state will wither away, and the government of men will be replaced by the administration of things." Yet, after sixty years, the government of men is as strong now as it ever was in Russia.

Reduction of trade-union authority. This would particularly have disturbed Karl Marx, but it cannot be denied that Lenin himself began the process when he defined the role of trade unions *after* the revolution as mere "schools of communism." Stalin finished the job by divesting the unions of all bargaining power, and turning them into simple "transmission belts" for the imposition of Party policy.

Creation of elite castes in government, management, diplomacy, the military, and even the arts. The "in-groups" in these and other areas of activity enjoy many special privileges denied (and even unknown to) the great mass of working people. Among these benefits are the personal use of chauffer-driven automobiles, the right to buy at special stores whose entrances are disguised from the public, prompt fulfillment of requests for tickets to cultural performances, admission to special restaurants and clubs, and—perhaps most important of all—the ability to travel abroad. What makes the situation even more disgusting to "true believers" in socialism, is that these privileges are usually passed on to the children of the elite, who often become the playboy (or playgirl) parasitic type which Marx said must not be permitted to exist.[14]

Failure to make a higher standard of living a "real" goal in any of the several Five-Year Plans so far adopted in the Soviet Union. Marx was sure that two generations of socialism, by converting all profits into social services and wages, would put a nation into the top rank of consumer goods. Actually, the main argument for Marxian socialism has long been that it will raise the standard of living of all the people. While there is no doubt that the people of the Soviet Union are better off today than they were under the Tsars, and that there are few unemployed and no starvation, nevertheless, the Soviet leaders cannot claim that their country is a model of the good life.

Increased contradiction between mental and manual labor, and between urban and rural life. At one time or another Lenin called both these phenomena "the most hateful aspect of capitalism," and Khrushchev echoed the condemnation. Yet the groups who are now in real control of all aspects of Soviet life never do—and most never have—done any form of manual labor and also strive to see that their children never do. Highly skilled manual laborers draw high wages in the Soviet Union, but they do not make the important decisions or enjoy the privileges accorded the elite who live by their wits. Also, even though the nation has been urbanized to a large degree, there are still aeons of difference between the collective-farm peasant and the industrial or office worker, and the system of selection in education is widening rather than narrowing these differences.

Dissolution of the Communist International and the failure to preserve a united front of the socialist nations. Even though Western peoples welcomed the break-up of what appeared to be the Communist monolith, in Eastern Europe and Asia, Marx would regard the event as a tragedy of the first magnitude. He actually believed that, after the Revolution in one country, the workers of other nations must immediately come to its aid in overthrowing their own governments. In the period 1917-1926, Lenin constantly preached his own doctrine that "socialism in one country" *could* survive, even though he was opposed by nearly all the other "true Marxists" of the world. And Stalin repeatedly stated that, without kindred socialist nations to support it, the Soviet Union was totally exposed to attack by surrounding capitalist states. When Hitler proved him right, Stalin determined that his borders in the post-war period would be protected at least against another invasion from the West. But the termination of friendly relations with Communist China would be regarded by Marx as a most severe blow to the cause of "workers of the world, unite!"

Toleration of religious practices and the restoration of the Church to active participation in social affairs. If there was one institution which Marx hated as violently as capitalism, it was Religion. He castigated primitive religions for blinding mankind to its deprivations, Judaism and early Christianity for their warped view of the origin of the world and of Man, medieval religion for its brake on scientific thought, and modern theocracies for their aid to oppressive governments. He would have applauded the first act of the new Soviet government in appropriating all the property of the Russian Orthodox Church (a store of wealth, by the way, which far exceeded the amount in the state treasury), and he would have endorsed the creation of the Society of Militant Atheists with its large headquarters and publishing plant in Moscow. Marx must surely have turned in his grave when Stalin (yes, Stalin!) restored the Patriarchate which Peter I had abolished in 1721, gave it the Atheist edifice for its offices, and turned over to it paper and the press so that it could publish Bibles! The fact that in return for these favors the Church agreed to cease its opposition to the government would be regarded by Marx as simply another example of religion supporting an oppressive regime.

The Social Perspective

Persistent problems which sixty years of Soviet socialism have failed even to ameliorate:

How to encourage truly creative thought in an atmosphere of dogma, repression, and fear. The process of inhibition starts in the elementary grades, where school children are taught never to doubt or contradict the teacher, and where the Young Pioneer organization (ages 8-15 years) indoctrinates the political infallibility of the Party leadership.

How to utilize the skills of millions of tenth-grade graduates who will not attend any kind of higher educational establishment. The rigid admission requirements permit only one out of four urban applicants, and one out of ten rural school graduates, to be accepted in universities or institutes.[15] This discrepancy also aggrevates the contradictions between town and village mentioned above.

How to increase the productivity of labor in Soviet industry and agriculture. The fact is that, despite great gains over the record of the Tsarist regime, the Soviet Union lags far behind the achievements of the West. Both the USA and the USSR, for example, have 25% of the labor force in industry, yet Soviet productivity is only 41% of ours. We have only 6% of our labor force in agriculture, as against 31% in the USSR, but our farm productivity is nine times theirs. Each American farmer feeds sixty persons; each Soviet farmer only five!

How to eradicate the many remnants of sexual inequality, such as "sexism," chauvinism, puritanism, and the extremely low power status of women. In some respects the Soviet regime has provided *real* emancipation to many women. Females constitute 70% of the medical doctors (*not* including nurses), 80% of the school teachers, 33% of the professors and 51% of students in higher education, and even 30% of all engineers.[16] In all these capacities women get equal pay with men. But one looks in vain for female university Presidents, or hospital Directors, or large factory Managers, of Cabinet Ministers. There are women in the Central Committee of the Party, but none in the Politburo or the Secretariat. A recent study reveals that of the 140 most important posts in the entire Soviet Union, not one is held by a woman. Nor has the situation ever been greatly different in all the years of Soviet history. During that time only four women have really held even limited power: one was the wife of Lenin, one was the wife of Molotov, one was the mistress of Khrushchev, and one was the early advocate of "free love" who practiced with

several male leaders and died recently after having served for twenty happy years as the Soviet ambassador to Sweden. In one of his rare attempts at humor, Karl Marx (obviously paraphrasing J.S. Mill) declared that "social progress can be measured exactly by the social position of the fair sex, including the ugly ones." Measured in terms of participation in the labor of society, Soviet women are emancipated to the point of exploitation, for they still bear the children and do all the household chores. But in terms of power and policy-making, they are no better off then were their grandmothers.

What to do about the persistence of Religion, and the seeming willingness of the officially atheistic government to permit its growth. It is very true that the Church is no longer permitted to proselyte, and that all religious instruction, even in the home, is forbidden for youth under 16 years. Nor can the Church oppose any state policy, although it is permitted to voice agreement. Finally, of course, the Church cannot impede the advance of science and so its greatest fault, according to Marx, is removed. Nevertheless, the few remaining active churches in the Soviet Union (perhaps 5,000 out of the 50,000 in 1917) do act as an opiate in that they distract minds from the grave problems of the day, offer solace in the next world, and by indirection acquiesce in the continuation of the *status quo*. Reliable reports indicate that church attendance is growing, especially among young people, despite the known fact that the secret police record such items in the dossiers. It is remarkable that after the early violent struggle of the state against religion, the atheistic tenets of all the Soviet leadership, and the active anti-religious campaigns of the Party, the youth organizations, the schools, and the press—religion still appeals to millions of Soviet citizens. The phenomenon is not only painful to the Soviet leaders, but also to many Western liberals who saw in the new Soviet regime a determined effort to erect a system of morals and ethics based upon enlightened human relationships rather than on ancient mores and superstitions.

In conclusion, one would like to draw a "balance sheet" on the successes and failures of the Soviet Union, but obviously such an act is impossible. What some people see as progress, others view as retrogression, and standards of Good and Evil vary in time, in space, and in individuals. But we might make a case for attempting such an analysis by citing the example of a young Frenchman who in 1835 produced a remarkable prophecy based on his studies of the United States and the Russian Empire:[17]

> There are at the present time two great nations in the world, which started from different points, but seem to tend towards the same end. I allude to the Russians and the Americans. Both of them have grown up unnoticed; and whilst the attention of mankind was directed elsewhere, they have suddenly placed themselves in the front rank among the nations, and the world learned their existence and their greatness at almost the same time. All other nations seem to have nearly reached their natural limits, and they have only to maintain their power; but these are still in the act of growth. All the others have stopped, or continue to advance with extreme difficulty; these alone are proceeding with ease and celerity along a path to which no limit can be perceived. The American struggles against the obstacles which nature opposes to him; the adversaries of the Russian are men. The former combats the wilderness and savage life; the latter, civilization with all its arms. The conquests of the American are therefore gained by the ploughshare; those of the Russian by the sword. The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends, and gives free scope to the unguided strength and common sense of the people; the

> Russian centres all the authority of society in a single arm. The principal instrument of the former is freedom; of the latter servitude. Their starting-point is different, and their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems marked out by the will of Heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe.

If, by our own careful attention to Soviet affairs, we can see that far into the future, the effort will surely be worthwhile.

NOTES

1 William H.E. Johnson. *Russia's Educational Heritage.* New York: Octagon Books, 2nd edition, 1969. p. ix.

2 Raymond Beazley, et al. *Russia from the Varangians to the Bolsheviks.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1918. *passim*

3 Abram L. Sacher. *A History of the Jews.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 5th edition, 1967. pp. 309-22.

4 Frederick L. Schuman. *Soviet Politics at Home and Abroad.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1946. pp. 109-13.

5 Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 27-28.

6 *Ibid*, pp. 46 and 307 n.

7 A coincidence discovered by Professor Albert Parry of Colgate University.

8 Dozens of histories of Russia bear witness to this program of "Russification."

9 Schuman, *op. cit.*, pp. 256-69.

10 Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 330-31.

11 *Ibid*, p. 283.

12 *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism.* Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 2nd edition, 1963.

13 *Narodnoe Xozyaistvo CCCP 1922-1972* (National Economy of the USSR 1922-1972) Central Statistical Administration, Moscow, 1972. pp. 425-445.

14 *U.S. News and World Report*, August 4, 1975, pp. 35-36.

15 Reinhard Meier. "Success and Limitations of Soviet Schooling" in *Swiss Review of World Affairs*, May 1975, pp. 13-15. Also *New York Times*, August 31, 1975, p. E7.

16 *Narodnoe Xozyaistvo, loc. cit.*, pp. 425-45.

17 Alexis de Tocqueville. *Democracy in America*, 1935.